

Appl. No. 10/006,331
Amdt. dated August 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 17, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the Office Action dated May 17, 2005, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1, 2, 5-14, 17-23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimada (U.S. Pat. No. 5,922,073; 2) rejected claims 3 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada in view of Enge (U.S. Pat. No. 5,812,961); 3) rejected claims 4 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimada in view of Cannon (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0094777). With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 7, 8, and 13 and submit new claims 25-30. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants believe all claims to be in condition for allowance.

Shimada discloses a technique for restricting access to various data items. Each accessible item of data has an associated password and location data. Access to such data item is permitted only if two conditions are true. First, the computer by which a user is requesting access to the data must be at a location that matches the location data associated with data item. Second, a user must enter a password that matches the password that also is associated with the data item. Each time access to a particular data item is requested, the system determines whether both of the aforementioned criteria are true. See Figures 1-3, Abstract, col. 3, line 35-col. 4, line 60; col. 6, lines 12-31.

Applicants amend claim 1 to require that the processor determines "at boot-up the location of the computer...and, invokes an operating mode for said computer based on the location area in which the computer is located." This limitation is in contrast to Shimada which does not teach or even suggest performing the claimed actions at system boot-up and instead advocates determining whether to permit access to a data item when such data item is request, and thus not before. For at least this reason, claim 1 and all claims dependent thereon are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Shimada. Although the Examiner did not use any other reference against claim 1, Applicants believe no other art of record satisfies the deficiencies of Shimada.

Claim 1 has also been amended to remove reference to the "input device" which was not necessary for patentability. Claim 1, as well as claims 7 and 8,

**Appl. No. 10/006,331
Amdt. dated August 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 17, 2005**

was also amended to refer to a "computer system" so as to maintain claim language consistency. These amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims in any way.

New claim 25, which depends on claim 1, adds the limitation that the "processor re-evaluates the location of the computer system at predetermined time intervals." Claim 26, which depends on claim 25, further explains that the processor "invokes an operating mode for said computer based on said re-evaluated location at said predetermined time intervals." Applicants do not find disclosure of these limitations in the art of record.

Applicants amend claim 13 to require "at boot-up, invoking an operating mode preset for the location area determined in (c)." Shimada, nor any other art of record, teaches or even suggests this limitation. Accordingly, claim 13 and all claims dependent thereon are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the art of record.

Newly added dependent claims 27 and 28 add additional limitations not believed to be disclosed in the art of record.

Newly added independent claim 29 requires the processor "to determine, at predetermined time intervals, the location of the computer system relative to a plurality of pre-programmed location areas and, to invoke at each such predetermined time interval an operating mode for said computer based on the location area in which the computer is located." None of the art of record teaches or even suggests this combination of limitations.

Claim 30 depends from claim 29 is patentable for the reason noted above, as well as requiring the processor to determine the location of the computer system during boot-up and also, at boot-up, to invoke an operating mode based on the boot-up location. This feature is not found or suggested by the art of record.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of

**Appl. No. 10/006,331
Amdt. dated August 3, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 17, 2005**

time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400